

Notice of Allowability

Application No.

09/600,824

Examiner

Chih-Cheng Glen Kao

Applicant(s)

WILSON ET AL.

Art Unit

2882

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to 8/11/03.
2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are 2-12, 14-28 and 34-37.
3. ☒ The drawings filed on 08 September 2000 are accepted by the Examiner.
4. ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of the:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 - * Certified copies not received: _____.
5. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
 - (a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
6. ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application. **THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.**

7. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
8. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
 - (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
 - 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No. _____.
 - (b) ☐ including changes required by the proposed drawing correction filed _____, which has been approved by the Examiner.
 - (c) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No. _____.

Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the margin according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).

9. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413), Paper No. _____ |
| 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08),
Paper No. _____ | 7 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Amendment/Comment |
| 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit
of Biological Material | 8 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance |
| | 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

1. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Gary Kindness on January 12, 2004.

2. The application has been amended as follows:

In claim 9, line 11; replace "part only" with - -only part- -

In claim 17, line 7, in the phrase "the at least one surface"; delete "the"

In claim 17, line 8, in the phrase "a patterned beam"; replace "a" with - -the- -

In claim 18, line 7; replace "part only" with - -only part- -

In claim 24, line 2; replace "may be" with - -is- -

In claim 37, line 8; replace "in order" with - -so- -

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 2-12, 14-28, and 34-37 are allowed.

4. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

With regards to claim 2, prior art does not disclose or fairly suggest a method of verifying the authenticity of a security document including the steps of folding the security document such that a patterned beam is caused to impinge upon an opacifying portion which thus acts as the

Art Unit: 2882

viewing surface, in combination with all the limitations in the claim. Claims 3-8 and 10-12 are allowed by virtue of their dependency.

With regards to claim 9, prior art does not disclose or fairly suggest a method of verifying the authenticity of a security document including the steps of folding the security document such that only part of a light beam passes firstly through a second at least partially transparent portion before being transmitted through a first at least partially transparent portion, said second at least partially transparent portion thus acting as a pseudo point light source, in combination with all the limitations in the claim.

With regards to claims 14 and 17, prior art does not disclose or fairly suggest a security document including an opacifying portion for impingement of a patterned beam thereupon by folding the security document, in combination with all the limitations in the claim. Claims 15, 16, and 19 are allowed by virtue of their dependency.

With regards to claim 18, prior art does not disclose or fairly suggest a security document including the security document being foldable such that a second at least partially transparent portion, acting as a pseudo point light source, is placed between a light beam and an optical projection element for transmitting only part of the light beam, in combination with all the limitations in the claim.

Art Unit: 2882

With regards to claim 20, prior art does not disclose or fairly suggest a method of verifying the authenticity of a security document including the steps of coating with an opacifying layer to form a viewing surface on the security document and folding the security document such that a patterned beam is projected onto the viewing surface, in combination with all the limitations in the claim. Claims 21-28 are allowed by virtue of their dependency.

With regards to claim 34, prior art does not disclose or fairly suggest a method of verifying the authenticity of a security document including the steps of placing a screen having a window in the security document between a light beam and an optical projection element by folding the security document such that the light beam passing through the window is substantially collimated light, in combination with all the limitations in the claim. Claims 35 and 36 are allowed by virtue of their dependency.

With regards to claim 37, prior art does not disclose or fairly suggest a security document including the security document being foldable such that a second at least partially transparent portion is able to be placed between a light beam source and an optical projection element so that a light beam passing through the second at least partially transparent portion is substantially collimated light, in combination with all the limitations in the claim.

Conclusion

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Art Unit: 2882

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chih-Cheng Glen Kao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2492. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F (9 am to 5 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ed Glick can be reached on (571) 272-2490. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



gk



EDWARD J. GLICK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER